REMARKS

The Examiner had previously stated that applicant should address the Examiner's note of the February 25, 2010 Office Action regarding trade secrets. The trade secrets discussed in the District Court case were ones that were created after the application was filed and also on subject matter not related to the claims of the patent. Therefore, applicant has disclosed the best mode of carrying out the invention at the time the application was filed.

Claims 1-6, 9, 12, 16, 21 & 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuniewicz (US Patent Number 6,585,589) in view of Quinn (US Patent Number 3,688,276).

Claim 1: Okuniewicz teaches device for paying out a bonus (Col 1, 43-46) to a player playing a gaming machine. (Fig. 1) there is a gaming machine (Slot Machine). The gaming machine obviously contains a processor for implementing a game of chance (including video poker) and paying off according to matching symbols. (Col 1, 20) There is a dispensing unit (Lottery Terminal). Since Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may dispense a ticket when a preset amount of coins are inserted that the dispensing unit may dispense a ticket when a present amount of coins are inserted (Col 3, 46-53), there must be a numeric counter for counting the number of coins placed in said gaming machine that counts coins until a ticket is generated. Okuniewicz does not teach visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket or the

2

number of coins inserted by the player. Nor does Okuniewicz teach resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. These are common functions on virtually any modern vending machine.

Quinn, which is also a lottery ticket dispenser, teaches visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. (Fig 1) Such a visible meter allows the player to know how much money he must insert and how much he inserted. Clearing the counter lets the player know that if he wants another ticket, he has to put in more money. These features add to user convenience and are, as previously pointed out, extremely well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Okuniewicz in view of Quinn to visually display to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as to reset the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated in order to add to player convenience.

There may be a misconception about what the Examiner is discussing about being random and what applicant's attorney is arguing about being random. Applicant agrees that Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may dispense a ticket when a preset amount of coins are inserted into the dispensing unit. But as stated above by the Examiner, Okuniewicz does not teach visually displaying

to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket or the number of coins inserted by a player.

What applicant has expressed previously is that the randomness is not from the machine, but the player playing the machine. Since in Okuniewicz the player does not know how many coins are needed to be placed in the gaming machine before a ticket is dispensed, according to the player, the ticket is dispensed randomly.

By providing a visual display of the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player, the player knows exactly how many coins are needed to be placed into the gaming machine before a ticket will be dispensed.

Since Okuniewicz discusses in its specification, the randomness of generating a ticket to the player, it would not be obvious to combine Okuniewicz with Quinn, since if the player knew how many coins were going to be placed in the machine in order to dispense a ticket, it would no longer be random to the player.

Okuniewicz wants the player to keep playing in anticipation that a ticket will be generated at some unknown coin to the user.

The present invention wants the user to keep inserting coins until a known amount of coins are deposited, known to the user, which will generate a ticket.

**These are two different inventions. Adding Quinn to Okuniewicz
changes the invention of Okuniewicz which specifically states at col. 1,
lines 43-46 that "there is therefore a need for a bonusing system which
produces a bonus which is randomly generated and includes a
bonusing factor beyond more credits."**

**Okuniewicz knew about the need to interface a slot machine and
a lottery terminal, as shown in col. 2, lines 17-21 but chose to make
the generation of a ticket random to the user.**

Furthermore, a combination of prior art elements, each performing their
normal functions in a predictable manner to yield a predictable result is obvious.
In this case, Okuniewicz teaches a slot machine that dispenses a lottery ticket
when a preset number of coins have been inserted into the machine. Quinn,
which also dispenses a lottery ticket when a preset number of cons have been
inserted into the machine, has a meter that displays the number of coins inserted
and the number of coins remaining prior to dispensing a ticket. In the
combination, Okuniewicz's slot machine/ticket dispenser works in its accustomed
manner. Quinn's lottery ticket dispenser/coin meter work in its accustomed
manner. The combination Okuniewciz and Quinn yield predictable results. The
combination is therefore obvious.

**Okuniewicz realized the combination of a lottery machine and a
gaming machine ticket dispenser. However, it was not obvious to
Okuniewicz to add the feature of telling the user how many coins were**

5

needed to generate a supplemental ticket on the gaming machine. Therefore, this was not obvious and would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding the ticket supplemental to a gaming award, see the underlined portion of the rejection above. Regarding the numeric counter continuing to count (presumably coins) from player to player until the dispensing unit dispenses a ticket, Okuniewicz has no mechanism for determining who deposits a coin. Neither does Quinn. Clearly, since neither device can determine when one player leaves & another player arrives, the numeric counters in both would continue to count coins until a ticket is dispensed.

For all of the above reasons, Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-6, 9, 12, 16, 21 and 23 are not obvious over the prior art.

Claims 7, 8, 11, 13 & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuniewicz and Quinn as applied to claim 1, 12 above, and further in view of Castellano et al. (US Patent Number 5,4779952).

Claims 7, 13: Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Both contain coin counters, but do not give details of the operation thereof. Okuniewicz bonuses a player based on number of coins played (Col 3, 51) but does not teach that the numeric counter coins pulses off the gaming machine's hard meter. Castellano teaches the method of operation of the coin counters. Castellano teaches that the numeric counter (12) counts coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter (52). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified

Okuniewicz and Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter count

coin pulses off the gaming machine's hard meter in order to carry out

Okuniewciz and Quinn's suggestion to count the coins entered by the player.

For the reasons stated above with regards to Okuniewicz and Quinn, the combination now with Castellano does not make the claims obvious based on applicant's response above.

With regards to Claims 8, 11, and 18, for the reasons stated above, these claims are not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Okuniewicz & Quinn as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Harlick

(US Patent Number 4,636,951).

Claim 22: Okuniewicz & Quinn teach the invention substantially as

claimed, but fail to teach networking the gaming machines such that a

combination of devices requires a certain number of coins before a ticket is

issued. Okuniewicz teaches that a ticket may be issued when a certain number

of coins are deposited to a machine. Harlick teaches networking a number of

machines in such a way that a player may move from machine to machine while

maintaining the same credit state. (Col 1, 62 & Col 2, 65-66) This allows the

player to move to a different machine if there is a machine malfunction without

any penalty. Clearly, applying Harlick's teaching to Okuniewicz & Quinn would

yield a networked system where a combination of devices require a certain coin

in before issuing a ticket. For instance, if a player places 9 coins in a first machine (where the trigger is 10 coins), and moves to a second machine, the system would issue a lottery ticket when the player puts the 10th coin into the 2nd machine.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Okuniewicz & Quinn in view of Harlick to have a network of gaming machines wherein a combination of devices require a certain number of coins before a ticket is dispensed.

What Claim 22 describes that it is the combination of coins placed in network machines which allows a ticket to be generated. It does not mean that a player should play one machine and go to a second machine in order to receive the ticket. What is described is the combination of coins in the network machines that when a coin is placed in the machine where the number is set visually to be displayed that when that person places a coin in the machine, a ticket is given to that person, it does not mean that only one person has to play multiple machines, but multiple people can play the network machines and a person receiving the ticket is the person who placed the coin in the network machine and the counter showed that that coin allowed the machine to generate the ticket. For these reasons and the reasons sated above, Claim 22 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
(516) 739-1500